

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, as amended, remain herein.

1. Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Helmut JP 2000-350404. Helmut discloses a motor with a stator core that rests on a base and is angled so that the windings are opposite a magnet on a yoke. See Helmut, Fig. 3. But, Helmut fails to disclose a plurality of winding parts that are integral with a motor mounting base, as recited in applicants' claim 1. Rather Helmut discloses a core plate 4 that is separate piece attached to the base plate 21. See Helmut, paragraph [0011].

Helmut further fails to disclose a motor base having a cylindrical motor mounting part, as recited in applicants' amended claim 1. Rather, Helmut discloses a core plate attached to the base and acting as a motor mounting part.

Regarding claim 2, Helmut fails to disclose that the core plate and the base plate are formed of a single silicon plate. The Office Action cites Helmut paragraph [0011] for support of this claim, but paragraph [0011] fails to provide support for the core plate and base plate being formed from the same silicon plate.

Regarding claim 3, Helmut fails to disclose cutting a plurality of tongues from a motor mount in a radial direction from or towards a cylindrical motor mounting part, thereby forming winding parts constituting the stator core, as recited in applicants' amended claim 3. As discussed above, Helmut discloses only a core plate and a base plate as separate elements, not tongues cut out of the base plate.

Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Helmut to render applicants' claims 1-3 obvious. Helmut provides no teaching that would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Helmut to render applicants' claims 1-3 obvious. Rather, Helmut discloses only a motor in which the core plate and base plate are separate pieces, and the core plate is fixed to the base plate.

Since Helmut fails to disclose every element of applicants' claims 1-3, Helmut is an inadequate grounds for rejecting claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

2. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Helmut and Katuo et al. GB 2159078. Katuo discloses a method of manufacturing a small motor by punching holes 1b in a cup-like yoke 1, 2; inserting projections 3a from a mounting plate 3, 4 through the holes, bending the projections 3a to prevent the yoke 1 from moving in a rotatable direction with respect to the mounting plate 3, and punching the projections with a jig 9, 9a, so that the material from the projections 3a is deformed, thereby extending over an adjacent surface of the yoke 1, and preventing vertical movement of the yoke 1 with respect to the mounting plate 3. See Katuo, Figs. 1-4 and the corresponding discussion in the specification.

Katuo fails to disclose cutting a plurality of tongues from a motor mount in a radial direction from or towards a cylindrical motor mounting part, thereby forming winding parts constituting the stator core, as recited in applicants' amended claim 3.

Katuo further fails to disclose forming a cylindrical motor mounting part and cutting a plurality of winding parts from the motor base by press processing, as recited in applicants' claim 4. Rather in Katuo, the base does not have a cylindrical motor mounting part.

Thus, each of Helmut and Katuo fails to disclose every element of applicants' claims 3 and 4. Neither Helmut nor Katuo discloses a motor base having a cylindrical motor mounting part. Nor do either Helmut or Katuo disclose forming winding parts from the motor base.

Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify or combine Helmut and Katuo to render obvious applicants' claim 4. Neither Helmut nor Katuo discloses any benefit or motivation for forming a cylindrical motor mounting part or winding parts from the motor base. Since Helmut and Katuo fail to disclose every element of applicants' claims 3 and 4, and since neither Helmut nor Katuo discloses any teaching that would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to render obvious applicants' claim 4, Helmut and Katuo are inadequate grounds for rejection of applicants' claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, all claims 1-4 are now fully in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The PTO is hereby authorized to charge or credit any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 19-4293. Should the Examiner deem that any further amendments would be desirable in placing this application in even better condition for issue, he is invited to telephone Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

Date: March 21, 2008



Roger W. Parkhurst

Reg. No. 25,177

Adam C. Ellsworth

Reg. No. 55,152

Attorney Docket No.: 28951.5422

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 429-3000
Fax: (202) 429-3902